



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

m/v
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/941,311	08/29/2001	Tuan Vinh Le	MBT-103-A	6590
7590	01/15/2004		EXAMINER	
Mr. David J. Greer c/o Ridout & Maybee Suite 2400 One Queen Street East Toronto, ON M5C 3B1 CANADA			EVANISKO, GEORGE ROBERT	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3762	<i>S</i>
			DATE MAILED: 01/15/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/941,311	LE, TUAN VINH <i>CV</i>
Examiner	Art Unit	
	George R Evanisko	3762

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/941.311

George R Evanisko

Applicant(s)

LE, TUAN VINH

11

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 October 2003.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) 14-21 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) Claim(s) 1-13 and 22 is/are rejected.
7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 2.
4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____.
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Claims 14-21 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in Paper No. 4.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-13 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 1, “a stimulating first waveform signal” and “second waveform signal” are vague and inferentially included. It is unclear if the applicant is positively reciting and claiming the signals or a structure to produce the signals. Does the controller or another element (a pulse generator) produce the signals?

In claim 2, line 5, “the second waveform signal commencing...cycle” is vague and unclear if the controller is performing this function. It is suggested to use something similar to “wherein the controller is configured to commence the second waveform...cycle”.

In claims 4-6, “a calculated exhalation” and a “calculated inhalation period” are inferentially included and make the claim incomplete since no element has been set forth to calculate the periods.

In claim 6, line 2, “caused” should be “causes”.

In claim 8, "an elongate member" is inferentially included and the claim should positively recite the member before it is used in the claim in relation to another element.

In claim 9, "a stimulating third voltage waveform" is inferentially included.

In claim 10, "a belt" is inferentially included.

In claim 22, line 9, "stimulating electrical pulses" is vague and inferentially included. It is unclear if these pulses are the same pulses used in line 3 (it is suggested to use "said...pulses"). In addition, it is unclear what element is producing the pulses.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

Claims 1, 2, 7, 11, and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being clearly anticipated by Lattner et al (6212435).

Claims 1, 2, 7, 11, 12, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being clearly anticipated by Lurie et al (6463327).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 10 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lattner et al (or Lurie et al).

Lattner (or Lurie) discloses the claimed invention, and Lattner disclosing the belt for the respiration sensor, except for a belt sensor having two pressure sensing devices mounted on the belt for detecting expansion and contraction (claim 10) and another more specific user selective intensity input (claim 13). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the electrical stimulator as taught by Lattner (or Lurie), with the belt sensor having two pressure sensing devices mounted on the belt for detecting expansion and contraction and another more specific user selective intensity input since it was known in the art that respiration sensors use a belt having two pressure sensing devices mounted on the belt for detecting expansion and contraction to provide a conventional, easy to use sensor for detecting respiratory movements and since it was known in the art that electrical

stimulators use another more specific user selective intensity input to allow the patient or physician to select a stimulation output that is effective and/or comfortable to the patient.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 3-6, 8, and 9 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to George R Evanisko whose telephone number is 703 308-2612. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 6:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Angela Sykes can be reached on 703 308-5181. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703 306-4520.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703 308-1148.

George R Evanisko
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3762

GRE
January 12, 2004

1/12/04